

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is thanked for the clarity and conciseness of the previous Office Action, and for the citation of references, which have been studied with interest and care.

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed March 18, 2005. In the Office Action, claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicant has amended independent claim 8 and added a new independent claim 28 to further clarify the embodiments of the invention.

Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Drawings

In the previous Office Action, the drawings were objected to because they included reference numbers allegedly not mentioned in the description. (“312” and “314” in Figure 3).

Applicant has added an amended paragraph to the specification to remedy this objection. Particularly, number “312” is already particularly noted in this paragraph. However, Applicant has amended the paragraph to include a denotation to block 314 to address the Examiner’s objection.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this objection.

Information Disclosure Statement

In the previous Office Action, the Examiner objected to the previously filed Information Disclosure Statement. Applicant submits herewith a new information disclosure statement that complies with 37 C.F.R. 1.98 (a)(1).

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,813,715 issued to Yi.

Applicant has amended independent claim 8 and has added new independent claim 28 to further clarify the embodiments of the invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that Yi does not teach or suggest the limitations of amended independent claims 8 and 28. To begin with, amended independent claims 8 and 28 include limitations directed to *a home server that includes a service component installed in a network software stack* in which the service component detects when a server application listens for a connection.

Applicant respectfully submits that Yi does not teach or suggest this limitation.

In the previous Office Action, it was stated that Yi teaches a home server behind a firewall. Support for this was cited in column 2, lines 6-14 and column 4, lines 11-21 and was cited as teaching these limitations. However, Applicant respectfully submits that column 2, lines 6-14 of Yi relate to a firewall system that has a routing unit which connects a network channel for linking the virtual network interface to the in-office network and forms an internal communication channel through the routing unit. Whereas column 4, lines 11-21 describe the components of Figure 5 including a remote apparatus 510, a home-portal server 520, home-network apparatuses 560 and 570, a home gateway 540, etc.

Neither of these citations, nor the rest of Yi, teach or suggest *a home server that includes a service component installed in a network software stack* in which the service component detects when a server application listens for a connection.

Further, amended independent claims 8 and 28 include limitations related to *a forwarding agent directly connected to the home server* wherein the service component informs the forwarding agent that the server application is listening for a connection.

The previous Office Action cited Yi, column 4, lines 25-42 and column 5, lines 25-42 as teaching these claim limitations. However, in these citations, Applicant cannot find a teaching or a suggestion of a forwarding agent that is directly connected to a home server.

Looking at Figures 5 and 6 of Yi and the associated text, the only analogous entity that Applicant can find is the home portal server 520 that is coupled to the Internet and that is not part of the home service system and is not directly coupled to the home server. It appears that the IP address monitoring unit 614 in conjunction with authentication server unit 616 provide authentication to the user authentication client unit 617 of the remote apparatus 510. However, the home portal server is not directly connected to the home server as required by Applicant's claims.

Further, the invention described in detailed description of Yi does not teach or suggest *a gateway running a network addressed translation (NAT) software program* in which the gateway is connected to the forwarding agent and to the Internet agent via the Internet. A NAT software program is only described in the background section of Yi as a problem of the prior art to be overcome.

Lastly, Applicant's amended independent claims 8 and 28 include limitations directed to: *the Internet agent providing the remote client access to a service running on the home server and the Internet agent and the forwarding agent becoming layer four routers*. Applicant cannot find this teaching or suggestion in Yi.

In fact, Yi teaches a remote apparatus having a VPN client unit 619 and a home gateway having a VPN and server unit 622 to create a VPN network between the two; but nowhere teaches or suggests an Internet agent and a forwarding agent becoming layer four routers.

Support for the Internet agent and the forwarding agent becoming layer four routers that are utilized to preserve end-to-end session level security can be found in Applicant's patent application on: page 4, last paragraph; page 15, last paragraph; page 16, second paragraph; and is illustrated in detail in Figure 4.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Yi does not teach or suggest the limitations of Applicant's amended independent claims 8 and 18 and that therefore these claims are allowable and should be passed to issuance. Further, the dependent claims that depend therefrom should also be allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks made above, it is respectfully submitted that pending claims 8-9, 11, and 28-30 define the subject invention over the prior art of record. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that all the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application. To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 02-2666 and please credit any excess fees to such account.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 6/22/2005

By 
Eric T King
Reg. No. 44,188
Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)

Attachments

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8A)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:

MAILING

FACSIMILE

deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450,
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and Trademark Office.

Date: 6/22/2005


Nicole Erquiza

6/22/2005

Date